

ECFS - Email Filing

<PROCEEDING>96-45

<DATE>02/08/2005

<NAME>Richard Green

<ADDRESS1>10430 Drew Way

<ADDRESS2>

<CITY>Stanton

<STATE>CA

<ZIP>90680

<LAW-FIRM>

<ATTORNEY>

<FILE-NUMBER>

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> RC

<PHONE-NUMBER>714-995-8880

<DESCRIPTION>

<CONTACT-EMAIL>

<TEXT>I do not want to pay more for my telephone service! I urge you to reject a flat fee proposal that would change how contributions are made to the Universal Service Fund. I am concerned that this proposal could make my current service unaffordable.

Almost 1/4 of my phone bill for my land line is taxes and fees. My wife and I have bare minimum cell phone service so that we can make calls in emergencies, make 911 calls if unsafe drivers are on the road and don't have to search for a pay phone if our vehicles are disabled. It's bad enough we rarely make any long distance calls either with lanline or cell phones, yet are saddled with utility taxes and myriad fees on cell phones and landlines that make having a less than \$20 per month phone bill impossible. Why am I taxed so heavily to subsidize others to have service?

Under the flat fee proposal you are considering, people who make few long distance calls would pay the same as people or businesses that make many calls. In other words, low-volume and primarily residential customers would bear the same universal service fund burden as a high-volume residential or business customers. This is unfair!

I use my wireless phone for safety, security and convenience. I don't want to lose these benefits so that big businesses can pay less than their fair share. I urge you to reject the proposal to move the USF collection system to a flat-fee.

Keep the USF Fair!

Sincerely,

Richard Green

10430 Drew Way

Stanton, California 90680-1510

